

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 1, 3, 9, 11-12, 14 and 19 have been amended. Independent claims 1, 9, 14 and 19 have been amended to reflect the nature of the at least one data acquisition signal and the nature of taking time interval measurements of the at least one data acquisition signal. For instance, the at least one data acquisition signal includes a pixel clock signal, and at least one time interval measurements of the at least one data acquisition signal is based on the pixel clock signal. Claims 3 and 12 have been amended to properly depend upon independent claims 1 and 9, respectively. Lastly, claim 11 has been amended for cosmetic reasons.

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-16 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,740,352 to Philipp, et al. (“Philipp”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,323,828 to Perez (“Perez”). As noted by the Office action, Philipp does not explicitly disclose taking time interval measurements of the data acquisition signals. (Office Action, page 6, ¶ 1). In fact, Philipp does not appear to explicitly or implicitly disclose taking time interval measurements of the data acquisition signals. In contrast, Philipp addresses the testing of intensity and color values for each pixel of interest on a display. (Col. 2, lines 52-63). In other words, Philipp appears to address a testing system operable to test and measure, among other things, data integrity. While Philipp does not teach taking time interval measurements of the data acquisition signals, the Office action cites Perez (Col. 4, line 51) as teaching this limitation. The cited Perez reference is specifically directed at, among other things, an analog/RGB CRT data testing environment and describes performing a time measurement between two consecutive falling edges of the VSync signal. In this manner, Perez does not teach a digital display environment nor taking time interval measurements based on a pixel clock signal. Because Perez fails to teach Applicants’ claimed method of taking at least one time interval measurement

based on the pixel clock signal and because the reference is not properly combinable with Phillip, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

For example, with respect to newly amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully note that the Perez reference fails to teach or suggest a method for automated testing of display signals from video graphic circuitry wherein the at least one data acquisition signal includes a pixel clock signal and wherein at least one time interval measurement is based on the pixel clock signal for digital displays. In fact, Perez is silent as to using or measuring data acquisition signals based on a pixel clock signal because the Perez system is directed towards an analog system where the display signals from the VGA circuitry do not include a pixel clock signal. (See Present Application, page 10-11 for a discussion on the ability of, among other formats, LVDS and TMDS formats to incorporate pixel clock signals; page 12-13 for a discussion of the undesirability of analog RGB format systems to incorporate a pixel clock signal). Therefore Perez does not teach the claimed subject matter wherein a time interval measurement is taken based on the pixel clock signal. For this reason alone, claim 1 is in proper condition for allowance.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully repeat the relevant remarks made in the previous response filed on August 11, 2005 noting that Philipp cannot be properly combined with Perez.


For at least the aforementioned reasons, independent claims 9, 14 and 19 are also in proper condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 3-4, 7-8, 10-13, 15-16 and 20 contain additional novel and non-obvious patentable subject matter and are allowable for at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claims 1, 9, 14 and 19.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 1, 2005

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

VEDDER, PRICE, KAUFMAN &
KAMMHOLZ, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005